

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 5-12 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Claims 5-12 are rejected under 35 USC §112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected because the term “high support performance” is said to be a relative term rendering the claim indefinite. Claims 5-12 are amended to delete the phrase “of high support performance.”

The claims are also rejected because the phrases “respective fingers, four-finger, a five finger body” has no clear and definite meaning as to the number of fingers being claimed. Applicants respectfully traverse. It is clear from the specification that the fingers, the four-finger body, and the five-finger body refer to different portions of the glove, as shown, for example, in Figures 3b-3e, and described at various locations in the specification, such as Page 7, Lines 20-23, Page 7, Line 25 – Page 8, Line 1, Page 9, Lines 2-3, and Page 10, Lines 10-13. Thus, the claim is not indefinite because it merely recites that these different portions of the glove are knitted on a rib-knit structure basis using a stretch elastic yarn.

The examiner also objects to the term “knotted” in claims 5 and 9, and questions whether this is a knit stitch being claimed. In the context of the claimed invention, the phrase “knotted” is described, referring to JP Laid-open Patent Examination No. Hei 8-188942, at Page 7, Lines 9-14 (as well as in U.S. counterpart 5,628,209). Knotting is simply a technique for tying or otherwise securing the yarns at the end of one portion of the knitted fabric and the beginning of a next portion of the knitted fabric so as to prevent the knitted fabric from becoming unraveled. This technique is also described, for example, in USP 6,578,389, USP 6,301,939, and USP 5,467,616. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the phrase “knotted” is clear in the context of the claimed invention.

Claim 7 and 11 are objected to because the phrase "high density" is said to be an indefinite relative term. The claims have been amended to delete the phrase "high density."

Claims 8 and 12 are rejected because the phrase "gradually reduced" is unclear as to how and what dimension is being reduced. Claims 8 and 12 are amended by changing the term "part" to "width" and by deleting the phrase "in knitting width."

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing amendments and/or explanations obviate the rejections under §112, ¶ 2, and requests therefore that the rejections be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

2/27/08

By



Richard Wydeven
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,881
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, p.c.
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202)783-6040